Equal Justice Works' Veterans Legal Corps Program: Final Evaluation Report

Introduction and Objectives

Cloudburst Consulting Group, Inc. (Cloudburst) was engaged by Equal Justice Works in July 2014 to conduct an evaluation of its AmeriCorps-funded veterans' legal corps program (VLC). This document outlines the evaluation questions and associated planned data collection and analysis activities undertaken, as well as research findings, for a comparative report of outcomes for the VLC for activities in the 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 program years against similar, non-AmeriCorps-funded programs and against estimates of outcomes for unserved veterans.

Program Background and Prior Research

The problem the VLC addresses, while it can be simply stated, is born from a set of complex, mutually supporting systemic failures -- Veterans in America are often prevented from full and constructive participation in society because of complicated legal problems directly connected to physical and mental injuries sustained during their military service.

This cascade of negative outcomes begins with service-connected injuries to the mind or body of the veteran, such as post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) or traumatic brain injury (TBI). Of the over 1.6 million men and women deployed to fight in Iraq and Afghanistan, it has been estimated that eighteen percent suffer from major depression or PTSD and nineteen percent of Iraq and Afghanistan service members experienced a probable TBI during deployment.[1] Earlier conflicts produce comparable or higher rates of mental health issues: 26% of Vietnam-era veterans are estimated to have PTSD.[2] In contrast, just 7.8% of the general population in the U.S. suffers from PTSD.[3] Often multiple simultaneous injuries present as mental and physical comorbidities, such as PTSD and TBI.

While veterans with service-connected disabilities are entitled to VA disability benefits, including access to high-quality health care, a monthly income, housing vouchers and case

---

[1] T Tanielian et al., Invisible Wounds of War: Psychological and Cognitive Injuries, Their Consequences, and Services to Assist Recovery. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2008. http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/MG720.html. Also available in print form.
[2] RA Kulka et al., The National Vietnam Veterans Readjustment Study: Tables of Findings and Technical Appendices, New York: Brunner/Mazel, 1990; and RA Kulka et al., Trauma and the Vietnam War Generation: Report of Findings from the National Vietnam Veterans Readjustment Study, New York: Brunner/Mazel, 1990.
[3] RC Kessler, A Sonnega, E Bromet, M Hughes, CB Nelson. Posttraumatic stress disorder in the National Comorbidity Survey. Archives of General Psychiatry 52(12), 1048-1060.

management services (38 U.S.C. § 1101), accessing these benefits has proven extremely challenging for many. From a procedural standpoint, it is necessary to prove a disability's connection to military service, and this can be difficult because of missing or incomplete medical and service records combined with a lack of understanding of complex regulations and procedures. This lack of expertise can lead an otherwise viable claim to be presented inappropriately or inaccurately, and thus denied.[4] In fiscal 2012, the VA denied 30% of claims, including 37% of PTSD claims.[5] Denied applications can be appealed for review by a board, and in 2011 the official report from VA indicated that 29% of initially declined claims that were so reviewed had been denied in error.[6] As might be expected with new, complex or otherwise poorly-understood conditions such as TBI, the error rate in initially denied TBI claims has been reported as high as 38%.[7]

The process of receiving appropriate VA benefits – preparing, filing, and in some cases appealing, claims – takes place in an environment of long delays. Initial claims on average take nine months (nearly four times the VA goal of 70 days), with appeals averaging just under 22 months.[8] In some jurisdictions, the wait is longer.

This situation would be troubling enough on its own – and in passing the Kennedy Serve America Act, Congress acknowledged this need and directed CNCS to establish Veterans Corps that assist veterans with disabilities, including helping veterans file benefits claims (42 U.S.C. §§ 12572(a)(4)(B)(iv), (vi)). However, the injury to the veteran goes beyond a lack of access to earned services, because income can decline when mental illness goes undiagnosed and untreated, leading to underemployment or unemployment. Further complicating matters, as many as 525,000 veterans have child support orders.[9] While a decline in income provides a legal basis to review and possibly reduce child support, a proper petition must be submitted to the court but frequently veterans are not able to access the legal help needed to accomplish this.[10] With income reduced or eliminated but judgments for child support or other administrative payments still standing as originally entered, the veteran's debt builds and the punishments escalate, cutting off access to necessary resources like the use of an automobile (as drivers' licenses are suspended) or valuable professional credentials (as occupational licenses are suspended). Fines, warrants, and debts of all types tend to accumulate during this period. The result may be unemployability, for all intents and purposes. If the escalating punishments reach the level of issuance of an arrest warrant for the veteran, he or she may be cut off from subsidized housing and even VA disability benefits. Those veterans in this situation who may manage to remain in the labor force can face wage garnishments as high as 65% making it impossible for them to cover basic living expenses.[11]

---

[4] P Sleeth, H Bernton, "Lost to History: Missing War Records Complicate Benefit Claims by Iraq, Afghanistan Veterans," Seattle Times, November 9, 2012. http://www.propublica.org/article/lost-to-history-missing-war-records-complicate-benefit-claims-by-veterans

[5] Office of Performance Analysis & Integrity, Veterans Benefits Administration, FY2012.

[6] Board of Veterans Appeals Annual Report, 2011.

[7] http://cironline.org/reports/accuracy-isnt-priority-va-battles-disability-claims-backlog-3983

[8] Ibid.

[9] U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, "Veterans in the Child Support Caseload", Washington, DC: HHS, 2011.

[10] S Berenson, "Homeless Veterans and Child Support", Family Law Quarterly 45(2), 2011.

[11] Ibid.

THE **CLOUDBURST** GROUP

Veterans in the midst of these troubles *literally cannot solve them on their own*. Child support and other fines and warrants are ordered by judges in courts of law, so lawyers are absolutely essential to resolving these issues. Non-lawyers cannot give legal advice or make appearances in court on behalf of the veteran because of laws prohibiting the unauthorized practice of law. The U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs' Community Homeless Assessment, Local, Education and Networking Groups (CHALENG) report in 2015 indicated that for both male and female veterans, legal assistance (for child support, eviction or foreclosure, or restoration of driver's licenses) remain near the top of the list of unmet needs.[12] Notwithstanding the presence of three quarters of a million lawyers practicing in the U.S., there remains a serious shortage of attorneys willing and able to provide the expert services that veterans can afford and, as demonstrated above, absolutely require. Veterans caught in the web of problems described above are subject to the same lack of access to legal services as other low-income persons in the U.S., where it has been repeatedly shown that at least 80% of the serious legal needs of low-income people go unmet each year.[13] With just one legal aid lawyer available for every 6,415 low-income Americans and half of those seeking assistance from federally-supported legal aid organizations turned away due to lack of resources[14], there is a serious "justice gap" that has only widened in recent years due to cuts in funding for legal aid programs and increased demands from low-income people harmed by the recession and the weak recovery. Those legal aid organizations that do exist generally do not have established networks with organizations that serve veterans. As a result, many veterans who qualify for the services of existing legal aid organizations do not access them and legal aid organizations do not possess in-house expertise in veterans' law, creating an even wider justice gap for veterans. To illustrate, veterans filed 94,281 claims for PTSD in 2013 yet the Legal Services Corporation reported that only 796 veterans received help on their benefit applications from legal aid organizations.

The Equal Justice Works Veterans Legal Corps was created to address these issues by recruiting, training and placing 40 full-time lawyers and 380 minimum-time law student members and 400 leveraged volunteers at 19 high-need sites in California, Connecticut, Kentucky, Maryland, Ohio, Texas, Washington, West Virginia and other locales. In a three year period, the Veterans Legal Corps intends to serve 15,000 veterans by preparing, submitting and winning disability benefit cases, reducing fines and debts, and providing advice on and resolving other legal problems. The program's ultimate goal is to enable veterans to return to a high-functioning role in their communities.

The program's theory of change is that by increasing the current supply of veterans' legal services through the work of Fellows located at host sites, the VLC program will result in successful resolution of legal issues adversely impacting the health and economic position of veteran clients of the program. Fellows, having established an experience base in the area of veterans law, may then go on to provide a successful career's worth of service to this client population.

---

[12] http://www.va.gov/homeless/docs/chaleng/52015_CHALENG_2015_Fact_Sheet.pdf
[13] Legal Needs and Civil Justice: A Survey of Americans, American Bar Association, 1994; and The Washington State Civil Legal Needs Study, Washington Supreme Court, 2004.
[14] Legal Services Corporation, Documenting the Justice Gap, 2005 and 2009.

THE
CLOUDBURST
GROUP

In a program assessment conducted for Equal Justice Works by John A. Tull Associates in 2013 and consisting of partner surveys and case reviews, the independent researchers found the following:

- Survey responses for veteran-serving organizations acting as partners to Equal Justice Works' VLC program indicated their overwhelming agreement (52.6% strongly agree, 36.8% agree) with the proposition that the VLC "has been successful in removing legal impediments to veterans obtaining employment, benefits, housing, healthcare and other needed services, even if the individual has not yet been able to obtain such opportunities or benefits."

- Data from case reviews for 28 clients represented by the program found significant downward modifications in child support agreements, or reductions or forgiveness of arrearages. An average of $25,508 of forgiven arrearages was accomplished per client, with an average reduction in monthly payments of $299.

- Similarly, in the case of 72 clients represented by the program in matters relating to tickets, fines or penalties, the attorneys secured reductions or eliminations totaling $73,714, and the reinstatement of suspended or revoked drivers' licenses in six cases.

- 20 veterans had felonies reduced to misdemeanors, or had criminal records expunged.

- Projects handling veterans' benefit cases recovered $1,567,130 in retroactive benefits, averaging over $2,400 per month for the veterans represented.

Evaluation Design

The current evaluation was quasi-experimental in nature, involving statistical comparisons of outcomes for clients in VLC and the comparison group of non-VLC programs providing legal services to homeless and low-income veterans in California. A search for an additional set of contrasts, for unserved veterans, yielded only very limited data which are discussed in this report's section on success rates.

Where possible we employed the entire homeless and low-income veteran case census for the program for the year in question to avoid issues with inferences arising from sampling. We attempted to compare outcomes for all types of legal matters (e.g. expungements, eligibility determinations, benefits) for which outcomes data are available across VLC and comparison sites. The study also encompasses elements of a process evaluation, in order to provide background and context to address the "why" questions typically attending a determination of differences in outcomes.

The *timeframe* for the evaluation includes data on the resolution of legal matters for homeless and low-income veterans represented in litigation or in administrative processes from the 2013-2014, and 2014-2015 VLC program years (generally August to July). In all cases we use program administrative data on the whole homeless and low-income veteran population served by the program (using data in administrative systems permitted us to go back to the 2013-2014 program year, reduced burden by using existing data collection processes to the greatest extent possible, and resulted in greater data quality and standardization). We did not match treatment and comparison cases but addressed any client population differences among programs in the following ways:

- By reporting summary statistics on program differences in age, gender, race/ethnicity, and era of conflict to provide a basis for understanding macro-level differences in populations served;
- By reporting individual outcome findings by age, gender, race/ethnicity, and era of conflict to attempt to condition on or control for those factors considered one at a time;
- By controlling for age, gender, race/ethnicity, and era of conflict simultaneously in regression analyses addressing the question of whether specific program participation (VLC or non-VLC) impacts outcomes.

The *beneficiary population* studied is homeless and low-income veterans, particularly those living with mental health or substance use disorders; the geographic focus as noted above is the State of California, with study sites including Los Angeles and the Bay Area (San Francisco and Oakland). Los Angeles is the site of a number of VLC-supported fellows and one of these supported programs, the Inner City Law Center, served as the "treatment site."

The following were the initially proposed evaluation questions for this study:

1) Do outcomes (successful resolutions, economic values of judgments or administrative determinations) differ for homeless and low-income veterans assisted by the VLC and those served by other veterans' legal services programs and those for unserved homeless and low-income veterans?
   a) Outcomes by case type (tenant-landlord, VA program eligibility, VA benefit dispute, VA claim dispute, etc.)
      i) Rates of successful resolution for the homeless and low-income veteran
      ii) Economic values of judgments or administrative determinations (where applicable)
   b) Outcomes by client demographic (age, race, era of conflict)
2) If outcomes are found to differ between VLC and non-VLC programs, why is this the case?
   a) Differences in client or case characteristics (multivariate analysis)
   b) Differences in client case management (process evaluation)
   c) Differences in training or specialization of attorneys handling veteran legal matters (process evaluation)
   d) Differences in other resources (process evaluation)
3) Are longer-term outcomes (employment, income, housing) identifiable for VLC and non-VLC clients, and are there differences in these outcomes?

The initial evaluation design was submitted on August 29, 2014. It was approved by the donor on October 10, 2014.

Data Collection: Control Sites and Desk Research

Approaching SSVF Sites

Equal Justice Works requested during revisions to the design document to have Cloudburst attempt to expand data gathering on control sites statewide. Cloudburst agreed to try, and proposed using the fact that Supportive Services for Veteran Families (SSVF) can provide legal services, and is required to report any referrals for such services into the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS; a system with which Cloudburst is very familiar as a HUD TA provider), to provide an initial set of Continuums of Care (CoCs; and via these, legal services providers) to approach with data sharing agreements for "case" and client data. SSVF was intended to include the collection of administrative data on legal services provided, and we

intended to use these data to follow up with non-VLC sites on the characteristics of these clients and their legal issues as well as the disposition of these actions.

This approach meant that other sites in California were to be reviewed for inclusion in the study as control sites *on the basis of reporting SSVF data into a local HMIS but would require VLC not to have been involved in providing staff attorneys*. Inclusion of these sites in the study was therefore intended to be purposive and not probabilistic.

Cloudburst provided a list of CoC points of contact obtained via HUD HMIS contacts for Equal Justice Works' review and comment on October 16, 2014. Equal Justice Works approved the list the same day. Outreach and contact tracing began on this group immediately.

After 10/16/2014, over the course of the next 7 months, Cloudburst approached 127 first- or second-round contacts by phone and/or e-mail:

- 48 initial county-level CoC contacts plus CA balance-of-state CoC
- 79 referrals to HMIS specialists for SSVF data review or to services providers

Twelve initial contacts provided no response or referral; we continued to move down the HUD-maintained list to find the appropriate point of contact for initial review of SSVF data to identify "cases" and legal services providers as relevant.

Fifteen CoCs definitively reported no legal services provided throughout the study period via SSVF, and so had no referrals to provide:

- Fresno/Madera
- Kings/Tulare
- Sonoma (only data before 9/30/2013; data quality poor after that)
- Santa Clara
- Yuba-Sutter
- Oxnard/Ventura/San Buenaventura
- Santa Maria/Santa Barbara
- Pasadena
- Santa Cruz
- Monterey-San Benito
- San Francisco
- San Mateo
- Riverside
- Placer
- San Diego

We made second-round contact with a number of CoCs' service providers and explored agreements:

- San Luis Obispo (2 providers came on line in 2014-15)
- Central Sierra (Amador, Calaveras, Tuolomne; 2 providers came on line in 2014-15)
- Sacramento County
- Bakersfield/Kern County (2 providers)
- Santa Ana/Anaheim/Orange (3 providers)
- San Bernardino (2 providers, 1 with data)

Follow-up monitoring and contact with these sites continued through October 2015, but sites were either unwilling to provide data or had no significant case volume to share.

One auxiliary finding from this study is therefore that the legal support services dimension of the SSVF program may not be capitalizing on all opportunities to assist a population we know has significant unmet need. This serves to further highlight the importance of programs like VLC.

Desk Research on Other Programs

We also conducted a desk review of available client and outcome information in other federally funded programs or systems such as HMIS, Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH), the Grant Per Diem Program, SSVF, and others. We also contacted other organizations of national scope for their administrative data – such as the Legal Services Corporation (LSC) for data from its annual *LSC By The Numbers* compendium; and conducted an environmental scan on national or state-level statistics on homeless and low-income veterans' unmet legal needs (such as data from the annual Veterans Affairs CHALENG survey), as well as success rates in relevant legal and administrative matters from any other available sources.

Outreach to Legal Services Corporation also provided national-level numbers on case volumes and some very limited disposition data. Additional discussions with LSC staff determined that LSC *does not require, nor maintain, any outcome data* that can be used to compare "success rates" of comparable control sites. National and California data are still useful for comparisons of client and case characteristics; and we have included comparisons of treatment and control sites to California and national averages in this final report where possible.

Another Route: Interest on Lawyers' Trust Accounts (IOLTA) Measures and Sites

During our extended desk research phase, we found that a number of states had adopted an expanded set of outcome measures for their Interest on Lawyers' Trust Account (IOLTA)-funded public interest law programs. These measures included both the ability to code successful resolutions of cases, permitting "success rates" to be calculated; and the collection of standardized economic benefit information from a wide range of potential case types.

We contacted New York, Virginia, Maryland, the District of Columbia, Texas, Arizona and California at the State Bar level (and later at the provider level) to discuss their use of these extended measures. We found in most cases that data were only collected in the aggregate (so no case-level information remained) and that veterans' cases could not be examined separately.

However, one IOLTA lead produced a well-established California-based public interest firm with a significant volume of veteran outcomes that was willing to act as a control site under a condition of anonymity. That site's data constitute our control set. The control site provided deidentified outcomes data for veterans in March 2015 (725 records) and again in October 2015 (908 records).

We consider the IOLTA outcome measures to be an extremely compelling set of tools for tracking the effectiveness of veterans' legal services programs and would advocate for their expanded use (or even for their adoption among Equal Justice Works' other VLC subrecipients), provided that case-level information can be preserved and veterans' cases tracked separately through the use of a "veteran" or "veteran household" flag on the data collection forms.

Data Collection: Recipient and Treatment Site

Cloudburst began with unstructured interviews with Equal Justice Works staff in order to clarify objectives and outputs of the research; and with the staff or leadership of Equal Justice Works grantee programs in order to explore and identify potential treatment or control sites.

We reviewed data and reports provided by Equal Justice Works including prior evaluations and outputs of regular grantee monitoring to identify potential indicators already present in administrative records, as well as correspondence with CNCS staff providing evaluation technical support to understand the context and requirements for this evaluation.

Los Angeles was chosen as a treatment site, with Inner City Law Center as an exemplar program, because of VLC's significant support for that program and because of its ability to provide detailed outcome information for veterans' cases.

We made arrangements for one site visit consisting of four working days in California for one staffer to both conduct interviews and review the case management platform and export and de-identify data from ICLC's Time Matters system and the auxiliary outcomes table their staff had created. While on-site, our staffer created a set of queries on ICLC's auxiliary outcomes table which would permit extraction of veterans' matters and associated outcomes to an Excel file.

Cloudburst staff extracted 1094 matters and associated outcomes in the last week of April, 2015 while on-site. Once data were placed in Excel, safely outside the Time Matters system, our site visitor began cleaning, recoding and abstracting narrative information. Appendix A describes the conventions that were used to transform or append data. All data transformation formulas were retained in the Excel file, with analyst-added fields highlighted, so that updates to the data set could be added quickly and consistently. The end-of-April 2015 data from the treatment site and the end-of-March 2015 data from the control site formed the basis of our May 29, 2015 interim status presentation to Equal Justice Works.

In October 2015, we recontacted staff at ICLC and asked them to use the query profile we left in their system to perform another extract of their veterans' outcomes table, dump the file to Excel, deidentify the data, and e-mail it to us (this operation could be performed in a matter of minutes). Once we received the file and confirmed it contained deidentified records, we imported the new data set (now containing 1,236 records) into the established analysis workbooks and re-ran our analyses.

Qualitative Interviews

After the conclusion of quantitative analysis, Cloudburst scheduled interviews with program attorneys in the treatment and control sites to discuss items relevant to our process evaluation (the interview guide is found in Appendix B). We asked respondents to characterize their organization's history in the community and its history in providing services to veterans; the process of receiving referrals or other contacts with potential client veterans; the process of intake and case merit assessment; the client communication and management process; preparation of clients for appearances; and selection and training of staff attorneys.

Data Analysis

Data analysis consisted of 9 primary sets of reviews:

- Comparative descriptive statistics on treatment and control sites' client demographics

- Comparative descriptive statistics on treatment and control sites' client matters (case types)
- Comparative descriptive statistics on treatment and control sites' close codes
- Comparative descriptive statistics on treatment and control sites' success rates (for close codes associated with outcomes)
- Comparative descriptive statistics on treatment and control sites' economic values from successful cases
- Comparative descriptive statistics on treatment and control sites' success rates on client subgroups
- Comparative descriptive statistics on treatment and control sites' economic values from successful cases on client subgroups
- Logistic regression analysis on success rates versus client demographics and legal matters
- Regression analysis (using a generalized linear model) on economic values from successful cases, versus client demographics and legal matters.

Descriptive statistics tables were created in Excel, primarily via use of SUMIF and COUNTIF functions. Logistic regression and other regressions were run using version 3.1.3 (x86_64) of the statistical software environment known as R.[15]

Findings

Preliminary Report

Initial data collection and analysis concluded with the submission of a status report on May 29, 2015 on the data collection process, including preliminary findings comprising summary comparisons of program outcomes and a determination as to any data collection activities initially proposed that proved infeasible. Cloudburst presented these findings to Equal Justice Works leadership in a web conference on June 8, 2015, and used feedback received at that time to make final revisions to the plan for ongoing collection, analysis and reporting.

Current Findings

Case Types

There was a statistically significant difference in the types of cases taken, with the treatment site taking a large number of "individual rights" cases (reviews of case notes indicate these include matters such as traffic and jaywalking citations). The control site took a larger proportion of benefits and housing cases.

---

[15] R Core Team (2015). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL http://www.R-project.org/.

Type	Matters with Outcomes		Matters			Matters with Outcomes		Matters	
	Control	Treatment	Control	Treatment		Control	Treatment	Control	Treatment
Income Main-Gov Benefits	89	169	463	599		75%	54%	51%	55%
Individual Rights	0	134	0	323		0%	43%	0%	30%
Family	4	0	75	63		3%	0%	8%	6%
Consumer Finance	2	1	40	41		2%	0%	4%	4%
Education/Employment	0	0	0	13		0%	0%	0%	1%
Housing-Landlord Tenant	21	8	270	39		18%	3%	30%	4%
Health	2	1	34	8		2%	0%	4%	1%
Immigration	0	0	2	2		0%	0%	0%	0%
Not Filled out	0	0	5	0		0%	0%	1%	0%
Licenses (Drivers, Occ., Others)	0	0	10	0		0%	0%	1%	0%
Other Employment	0	0	3	0		0%	0%	0%	0%

Figure 1. Case Types

Close Codes

There was a statistically significant difference in the pattern of closing codes used in the two sites, with the control site having proportionally more "counsel and advice" close codes and the treatment site having a greater percentage of "limited action" codes, "administrative agency decision" codes and "court decision" codes. In contrast, using data from the Legal Services Corporation on disposition of *veterans' benefit cases* in 2013[16] or 2014[17], LSC subrecipients provided "counsel and advice" in 63 percent of cases (71 percent in 2014), "limited action" in 13 percent of cases (17 percent in 2014), "administrative agency decision" in 6 percent of cases (5 percent in 2014), and either "extensive" or "extended" services in 17 percent of cases (nearly zero percent in 2014). The control site, then, comes much closer to the LSC national averages for the distribution of close codes over the past 2 years while the treatment site appears distinct. We did receive additional data from Legal Services of Northern California (an LSC subrecipient) for 2014, and for *all legal matters handled for veteran households* (not just veterans' benefits cases), the practice provided "counsel and advice" in 68 percent of cases, "limited action" in 25 percent of cases, "administrative agency decision" in 1 percent of cases, "negotiated settlements" with or without litigation in a total of 4 percent of cases, and "extensive service" in only 1 percent of cases – again, placing the control site closer to LSC programs than the treatment site.

---

[16] http://www.lsc.gov/media-center/publications/2013-lsc-numbers
[17] http://www.lsc.gov/sites/default/files/attach/2015/08/LSC2014FactBook.pdf

	Counts		Percentages	
	Control	Treatment	Control	Treatment
Counsel and Advise	595	446	65%	42%
Limited Action	90	240	10%	23%
Referred after Legal Assessment	0	7	0%	1%
Client Withdrew	0	1	0%	0%
Did Not Return	0	9	0%	1%
Negotiated Settlement without Litigation	32	38	4%	4%
Negotiated Settlement with Litigation	39	3	4%	0%
Administrative Agency Decision	48	132	5%	12%
Appeal	0	9	0%	1%
Court Decision	9	131	1%	12%
Insufficient Merit to Proceed	1	0	0%	0%
Other	78	3	9%	0%
Extensive Service	22	46	2%	4%

Figure 2. Close Codes

Client Demographics

There was a statistically significant difference in the racial or ethnic composition of the client populations, with the treatment site having proportionally more Hispanic clients, fewer Black non-Hispanic clients and fewer White non-Hispanic clients.

Client Ethnicity	Counts		Percentages	
	Control	Treatment	Control	Treatment
Asian or Pacific Islander	32	47	4%	4%
Black - Not Hispanic	359	428	45%	39%
Hispanic	74	163	9%	15%
Native American	18	8	2%	1%
Other	31	38	4%	4%
Unknown	15	1	2%	0%
White - Not Hispanic	275	311	34%	29%
(Blank)	0	88	0%	8%

Figure 3. Client Demographics

The treatment site took on a significantly higher proportion of male clients. The treatment site took on a significantly higher proportion of clients with disabilities. The treatment site took on a significantly higher proportion of younger (18-59) clients (among non-missing age codes).

THE CLOUDBURST GROUP

	Counts		Percentages	
Client Gender	Control	Treatment	Control	Treatment
Female	226	205	28%	20%
Male	573	830	72%	80%
Client Age	Control	Treatment	Control	Treatment
18-59	539	606	60%	56%
60 or Over	243	170	27%	16%
Blank	123	312	14%	29%
Client Disability	Control	Treatment	Control	Treatment
Yes	570	772	63%	72%
No	334	295	37%	28%

Figure 4. Additional Client Demographics

Close Codes (Matters with Outcomes)

The following slides present "success rate" and "economic value" statistics for the subset of matters which could be coded to outcomes – generally associated with the following close codes:

F - Negotiated Settlement without Litigation

G - Negotiated Settlement with Litigation

H - Administrative Agency Decision

I - Appeal

I - Court Decision

It is on this subset of outcomes (N=430) that success rates are calculated.[18]

Success Rates

The success rates by type of client matter are difficult to compare because for the most part, the two programs' focal areas are different.

---

[18] One additional treatment-group record was dropped from analyses because it indicated a multi-million-dollar award which the staff attorneys of the program could not confirm.

Evaluation Question 1. Are the rates of successful outcomes in VLC and non-VLC programs equal?			
All Years (N=430)			
Case Type	Success Rate, VLC-Funded Program	Success Rate, Non-VLC Program	Success Rate from Literature
Income Main – Gov. Benefits	Rate: 92% Case Count: 169	Rate: 93% Case Count: 89	Rate: 0.0% Standard Error: 0.0%
Individual Rights	Rate: 82% Case Count: 134	Rate: N/A% Case Count: 0	Rate: 0.0% Standard Error: 0.0%
Family	Rate: N/A% Case Count: 0	Rate: 75% Case Count: 4	Rate: 0.0% Standard Error: 0.0%
Consumer Finance	Rate: 0.0% Case Count: 1	Rate: 100% Case Count: 2	Rate: 0.0% Standard Error: 0.0%
Education/Employment	Rate: N/A% Case Count: 0	Rate: N/A% Case Count: 0	Rate: 0.0% Standard Error: 0.0%
Housing	Rate: 75% Case Count: 8	Rate: 95% Case Count: 21	Rate: 0.0% Standard Error: 0.0%
Health	Rate: 100% Case Count: 1	Rate: 50% Case Count: 2	Rate: 0.0% Standard Error: 0.0%
Immigration	Rate: N/A% Case Count: 0	Rate: N/A% Case Count: 0	Rate: 0.0% Standard Error: 0.0%

Figure 5. Comparison of Success Rates in Different Case Types

Success rates by close code, however, are where we begin to see the impact of VLC Fellows on a program's performance. Whereas the control site is highly successful in those engagements where a more limited intensity of representation is required, it handles litigation less than the treatment site, and appeals and court decisions almost not at all. Of particular interest are the treatment site's rates for "Administrative Agency Decision" or "Appeal," as these can be compared to observed values from the Board of Veterans' Appeals (BVA) Annual Reports[19]: For veterans represented by an attorney, the BVA reports appeals achieve all dispositions except "Denied" at a rate of 86.3 percent for 2014; for veterans overall the rate is 78.5 percent for the same time period. The BVA reports that appeals are only disposed of as "allowed" in 30 to 35 percent of cases – the treatment site's rate is far higher (while only for a small number of cases).

Evaluation Question 1. Are the rates of successful outcomes in VLC and non-VLC programs equal?			
All Years (N=430)			
Close Code	Success Rate, VLC-Funded Program	Success Rate, Non-VLC Program	Success Rate from Literature
Negotiated Settlement without Litigation	Rate: 87% Case Count: 38	Rate: 100% Case Count: 32	Rate: 0.0% Standard Error: 0.0%
Negotiated Settlement with Litigation	Rate: 67% Case Count: 3	Rate: 97% Case Count: 29	Rate: 0.0% Standard Error: 0.0%
Administrative Agency Decision	Rate: 89% Case Count: 132	Rate: 90% Case Count: 48	Rate: 0.0% Standard Error: 0.0%
Appeal	Rate: 89% Case Count: 9	Rate: N/A% Case Count: 0	Rate: 0.0% Standard Error: 0.0%
Court Decision	Rate: 86% Case Count: 131	Rate: 67% Case Count: 9	Rate: 0.0% Standard Error: 0.0%

Figure 6. Comparison of Success Rates under Different Close Codes

[19] http://www.bva.va.gov/docs/Chairmans_Annual_Rpts/BVA2014AR.pdf

Economic Values

The economic values analyses presented here *must be regarded with significant caution* because of differences in the sites' recording of monetary awards, particularly the way monthly benefits are annualized. While the control site reported mostly lump-sum amounts, the treatment site reported both lump-sums and monthly benefit changes. With no consistent way to annualize monthly data, we were able to compare only lump-sum amounts, *which may overlook significant benefits reported as increases in monthly amounts by the treatment site*.

Evaluation Question 2. Are the economic values of successfully determined matters in VLC and non-VLC programs equal?		
All Years (N=430)		
Case Type	Economic Value, VLC-Funded Program	Economic Value, Non-VLC Program
Income Main – Gov. Benefits	Value: $28,997 Case Count: 168	Value: $32,613 Case Count: 89
Individual Rights	Value: $779 Case Count: 134	Value: $N/A Case Count: 0
Family	Value: $N/A Case Count: 0	Value: $12,500 Case Count: 4
Consumer Finance	Value: $0.00 Case Count: 1	Value: $11,272 Case Count: 2
Education/Employment	Value: $N/A Case Count: 0	Value: $N/A Case Count: 0
Housing	Value: $998 Case Count: 8	Value: $4,331 Case Count: 21
Health	Value: $0.00 Case Count: 1	Value: $1,159 Case Count: 2
Immigration	Value: $N/A Case Count: 0	Value: $N/A Case Count: 0

Figure 7. Comparison of Economic Values from Successful Resolutions

Success Rates (Subgroups)

The treatment site had a higher average success rate for the relatively small number of Asian-Americans served by both sites, and had relatively comparable although lower success rates in other racial or ethnic categories.

Evaluation Question 3. Do rates of successfully determined matters differ across subgroups?			
All Years (N=430)			
All Cases:	Success Rate, VLC-Funded Program	Success Rate, Non-VLC Program	Success Rate from Literature
Asian or Pacific Islander	Rate: 69% Case Count: 13	Rate: 60% Case Count: 5	Rate: 0.0% Standard Error: 0.0%
Black Non-Hispanic	Rate: 89% Case Count: 141	Rate: 92% Case Count: 47	Rate: 0.0% Standard Error: 0.0%
Hispanic	Rate: 80% Case Count: 40	Rate: 100% Case Count: 10	Rate: 0.0% Standard Error: 0.0%
Native American	Rate: 100% Case Count: 2	Rate: 100% Case Count: 4	Rate: 0.0% Standard Error: 0.0%
Other	Rate: 86% Case Count: 7	Rate: 100% Case Count: 3	Rate: 0.0% Standard Error: 0.0%
White Non-Hispanic	Rate: 90% Case Count: 96	Rate: 97% Case Count: 30	Rate: 0.0% Standard Error: 0.0%
Unknown	Rate: 93% Case Count: 15	Rate: N/A% Case Count: 0	Rate: 0.0% Standard Error: 0.0%
Blank	Rate: 92% Case Count: 13	Rate: N/A% Case Count: 0	Rate: 0.0% Standard Error: 0.0%

Figure 8. Comparisons of Success Rates for Different Client Demographics

THE **CLOUDBURST** GROUP

The treatment site had slightly lower success rates for most other client demographic categories as well.

Evaluation Question 3. Do rates of successfully determined matters differ across subgroups?			
All Years (N=430)			
All Cases:	Success Rate, VLC-Funded Program	Success Rate, Non-VLC Program	Success Rate from Literature
Female	Rate: 80% Case Count: 60	Rate: 93% Case Count: 27	Rate: 0.0% Standard Error: 0.0%
Male	Rate: 89% Case Count: 246	Rate: 93% Case Count: 72	Rate: 0.0% Standard Error: 0.0%
Disabled	Rate: 90% Case Count: 252	Rate: 93% Case Count: 87	Rate: 0.0% Standard Error: 0.0%
Non-Disabled	Rate: 76% Case Count: 54	Rate: 90% Case Count: 31	Rate: 0.0% Standard Error: 0.0%
60 or Over	Rate: 87% Case Count: 62	Rate: 89% Case Count: 36	Rate: 0.0% Standard Error: 0.0%
18-59	Rate: 88% Case Count: 168	Rate: 95% Case Count: 60	Rate: 0.0% Standard Error: 0.0%

Figure 9. Comparisons of Success Rates across Additional Client Demographic Groupings

We believe that both these results may be explained by the more challenging routes the treatment site takes to resolving client issues.

Economic Values (Subgroups)

The treatment site had higher (lump sum) economic values obtained from successful case resolutions for white non-Hispanic clients, but lower values for other subgroups. We would note again that the economic values results must be interpreted with caution because only lump-sum amounts are compared -- monthly benefits awarded in the treatment site, which averaged $1,916 (or $22,992 per year), *are not included as capitalized amounts*.

Evaluation Question 4. Do economic values of successfully determined matters differ across subgroups?		
All Years (N=430)		
All Cases:	Economic Value, VLC-Funded Program	Economic Value, Non-VLC Program
Asian or Pacific Islander	Value: $21,901 Case Count: 5	Value: $29,675 Case Count: 15
Black Non-Hispanic	Value: $11,695 Case Count: 47	Value: $16,741 Case Count: 47
Hispanic	Value: $9,951 Case Count: 10	Value: $95,034 Case Count: 10
Native American	Value: $47,700 Case Count: 4	Value: $7,928 Case Count: 4
Other	Value: $23,137 Case Count: 3	Value: $20,579 Case Count: 3
White Non-Hispanic	Value: $22,581 Case Count: 30	Value: $16,566 Case Count: 30
Unknown	Value: $19,202 Case Count: 13	Value: $N/A Case Count: 0
Blank	Value: $N/A Case Count: 0	Value: $N/A Case Count: 0

Figure 10. Comparisons of Economic Values for Different Client Demographics

Evaluation Question 4. Do economic values of successfully determined matters differ across subgroups?		
All Years (N=430)		
All Cases:	Economic Value, VLC-Funded Program	Economic Value, Non-VLC Program
Female	Value: $25,125 Case Count: 60	Value: $39,598 Case Count: 27
Male	Value: $13,675 Case Count: 245	Value: $19,363 Case Count: 72
Disabled	Value: $17,398 Case Count: 252	Value: $32,110 Case Count: 37
Non-Disabled	Value: $0.00 Case Count: 7	Value: $8,861 Case Count: 31
60 or Over	Value: $9,197 Case Count: 36	Value: $11,347 Case Count: 31
18-59	Value: $16,991 Case Count: 168	Value: $33,779 Case Count: 60

Figure 11. Comparisons of Economic Values across Additional Client Demographic Groupings

Economic values (with the same caveats) appeared lower for the treatment site for other demographic groupings as well.

Regression Analysis (Success Rates)

The foregoing analyses generally present differences in success rates or economic values against potentially relevant covariates (such as client demographics or types of legal matter) taken one at a time. Regression analysis is required to examine potential program-level differences in success rates or economic values of award, taking all observable client and case characteristics into account simultaneously.

Our approach was to create an indicator value for successful resolution of any F-, G-, H-, or I-coded case across the two programs (the dependent variable), along with indicator variables on which group (treatment or control) the case belonged to, case characteristics, and client characteristics (the independent variables). We then fit a logistic regression model (wherein the probability of "success" in the dependent variable is a function of the independent variables) via maximum likelihood methods using the glm function in R, with a binomial link function.

THE
CLOUDBURST
GROUP

Evaluation Question 5. Can differences in the rates of successful resolution of legal matters be fully explained by program participation, controlling for client characteristics (e.g. age, race, disability, type of matter)			
All Years (N=430)			
Explanatory Variable	Coefficient	Test Statistic	p-Value (*, **, ***)
Treatment Group	-0.3274	-0.567	.5709
Problem Code = 2	-1.0165	-2.489	0.0128(*)
Problem Code = 3	-1.4360		
Problem Code = 4	-2.4620		
Problem Code = 6	-1.0603		
Problem Code = 7	-2.2687		
Gender = Male	0.9212	2.160	0.0308(*)
Gender = Unknown	-14.9000		
Age 60+	-0.5982		
Age Other	-0.3015		
Race = Black Non-Hispanic	-15.2551		
Race = Hispanic	-15.8589		
Race = Native American	-0.5253		
Race = Other	-15.5650		
Race = White	-15.4405		
Race = Unknown	0.4358		
Disabled = True	-0.7162		
Disabled = Unknown	-1.6266	-1.968	0.0491(*)
Log-Odds Ratio for Program Membership Coefficient: N/A (Not Significant)			
Interpretation: No statistically significant difference in success rates taking all other factors into consideration			
Other Metadata: Function call is glm(formula = outcome ~ studygroup + problemcode + gender + agecode + raceeth + disabled, family = binomial("logit"), data = vlce); R version 3.1.3 (x86_64)			

Figure 12. Logistic Regression Results, Probability of Success

This suggests that, all factors taken into account, there is no statistically significant difference in success rates for veteran legal matters across the treatment and control sites.

Regression Analysis (Economic Values)

To model the difference in the economic yields of case handling across the two programs, we fit a regression via maximum likelihood (using the glm function in R with a normal link function) of a dependent variable representing the dollar value of judgments (a continuous variable) against the previously-used set of independent variables representing client or case characteristics. This analysis found that, all else equal, treatment group cases did not have significantly higher dollar-valued awards.

Evaluation Question 6. Can differences in the economic values of successfully determined matters be fully explained by program participation, controlling for client characteristics (e.g. age, race, disability, type of matter)?			
All Years (N=430)			
Explanatory Variable	Coefficient	Test Statistic	p-Value (*, **, ***)
Treatment Group	-7482.7	-1.292	0.19717
Problem Code = 2	-27443.9	-5.483	7.33e-08(***)
Problem Code = 3	-15226.3		
Problem Code = 4	-27430.6		
Problem Code = 6	-22920.3	-2.673	0.00781(**)
Problem Code = 7	-39597.7		
Gender = Male	-13167.8	-2.480	0.01354(*)
Gender = Unknown	-11695.5		
Age 60+	-13104.5	-2.580	0.01022(*)
Age Other	-825.3		
Race = Black Non-Hispanic	-13392.0		
Race = Hispanic	2884.7		
Race = Native American	-28475.8		
Race = Other	-28642.2		
Race = White	-9358.6		
Race = Unknown	-8878.2		
Disabled = True	22013.9	2.770	0.00586(*)
Disabled = Unknown	16430.3		
Log-Odds Ratio for Program Membership Coefficient: N/A (Continuous Dependent Variable)			
Interpretation: There is no significant difference in value of successful resolutions for the treatment site, taking all other factors into consideration			
Other Metadata: Function call is glm(formula = monetary ~ studygroup + problemcode + gender + agecode + raceeth + disabled, data = vlce); R version 3.1.3 (x86_64)			

Figure 13. Generalized Linear Model Results, Economic Values

As we remain concerned that the economic value analyses are potentially undermined by differences in how sites record the present value of future benefit streams, we sought a more defensible approach to analyzing differences in yields from legal matters across programs. Our approach was to create an *indicator value for positive dollar values* associated with successful resolution of any F-, G-, H-, or I-coded case across the two programs (the dependent variable), along with indicator variables on which program the case was handled by, case characteristics, and client characteristics (the independent variables). We then fit a logistic regression model (wherein the probability of "success" in the dependent variable is a function of the independent variables) via maximum likelihood methods using the glm function in R, with a binomial link function. In contrast to the previous regression on values which examined the magnitude of award size, this regression models only the *probability of any positive dollar outcome*.

Evaluation Question 6. Can differences in the economic values of successfully determined matters be fully explained by program participation, controlling for client characteristics (e.g. age, race, disability, type of matter)?			
All Years (N=430)			
Explanatory Variable	Coefficient	Test Statistic	p-Value (*, **, ***)
Treatment Group	0.01887	0.057	0.95459
Problem Code = 2	-0.84964	-3.100	0.00193(**)
Problem Code = 3	-1.63776		
Problem Code = 4	-0.36462		
Problem Code = 6	-0.92073	-2.086	0.03700(*)
Problem Code = 7	-1.89642		
Gender = Male	0.21767		
Gender = Unknown	0.76770		
Age 60+	-0.72550	-2.634	0.00843(**)
Age Other	-0.24187		
Race = Black Non-Hispanic	0.52217		
Race = Hispanic	0.64164		
Race = Native American	0.93857		
Race = Other	0.23350		
Race = White	0.81910		
Race = Unknown	0.08705		
Disabled = True	0.90448	2.169	0.03009(*)
Disabled = Unknown	-0.16090		
Log-Odds Ratio for Program Membership Coefficient: N/A (Not Significant)			
Interpretation: There is no statistically significant positive difference in the probability of resolutions with economic values for the treatment site, taking all other factors into consideration			
Other Metadata: Function call is glm(formula = anymonetary ~ studygroup + problemcode + gender + agecode + raceeth + disabled, family = binomial("logit"), data = vlce); R version 3.1.3 (x86_64)			

Figure 14. Logistic Regression Results, Probability of Monetary-Valued Resolution

This formulation found no significant difference in the probability of receiving a dollar-valued resolution across the two types of programs.

Findings from Qualitative Interviews

Key informant interviews conducted with staff attorneys at the treatment and control sites yielded a number of insights about program operations:

- The treatment site noted that the impact the VLC program had on their service to veterans was principally that it allowed them to handle more cases, extending their capabilities to serve this group. After approximately 3-6 months in their position, a VLC-supported staff attorney could handle 70 cases per year. The interviewee noted that during the period in which their program had two VLC-supported staff attorneys (with only partially overlapping tenure), the two combined for 150 veterans' cases.
- The ability of the treatment site to handle more veterans' cases, and to handle cases that other organizations might not take on, raised the profile of their program, bringing in funding as well as media and other attention, which itself brought in other partners to deepen support for the program's clients.
- The treatment site's veterans program consciously focuses on benefits, discharge upgrades, and tickets; the VLC-supported attorneys do not subspecialize across problem codes but did specialize somewhat by era of conflict, with one attorney focusing more on OEF/OIF veterans and the other spending more time with Viet Nam-era veterans and homeless veterans.
- The treatment site actively goes out in the community to find veterans – attorneys visit shelters at predetermined times announced by flyers. Our interviewee reports that the involvement of caseworkers is key in coordinating the presence of potential clients at their shelter visits. Shelter visits consist of 4-5 hours of time on site in 30-40-minute intake interviews, during which time between 6 and 15 vets may be served. If a need for

referral to a different program (for example, to a specialist in family law) is identified, this referral can happen on the spot; clients can also sign retainer agreements for the treatment site's veterans program at that time.

- The treatment site's shelter partners pre-screen for veteran status and generally look for mental health issues that may indicate the veteran is particularly likely to be underserved; the program's staff attorneys will conduct a merit assessment in deciding whether to take on the veteran's legal matter. The treatment site does not consider "impact cases" or precedential value in determining whether to render assistance.

- The treatment site's staff attorneys undergo military cultural training; supervisory attorneys in the practice teach courses at UCLA on veterans' benefits and discharge upgrades, and the practice has a relationship with a retired commissioner who trains attorneys on ticket clearance.

- Generally in the treatment site, attorneys and clients will meet three times in person – at intake, at a second meeting that occurs once all records have been produced and at which the client may sign declarations, and at a final meeting where the attorney goes over the client's brief or decision and the client signs paperwork. There may be several calls that occur throughout the engagement, but these are the principal drivers of in-person meetings.

- On the subject of appearances, generally in the treatment site clients proceed under 977 waivers and are not required to appear. However, for those situations in which the client wishes to or must appear, the treatment site's staff attorneys prepare the client for what to expect, including any potential behavioral triggers (armed guards or bailiffs, metal detectors, patdowns). For administrative hearings the staff attorney preps the client in person, including mooting or role-playing.

- The treatment program connects clients to a variety of services including non-VA mental health, clothing, furniture, and in some cases even support for victims of trafficking.

- The treatment program estimates that it loses approximately 25% of clients to follow-up during an average engagement, generally losing clients to more pressing matters (food and shelter) between intake and the records review in-person meeting. Loss to follow-up represents the single largest barrier to successfully resolving a client's legal matter, in the view of the interviewee at the treatment program.

- The treatment program's interviewee regards the key catalyst for successfully resolving a client's legal matter to be persistence – the willingness to "deep dive" into case law, records, etc., and not to be put off by the challenge of a case. With this recognition comes an understanding that the program will not be handling high case volumes.

- The control site has operated for over 30 years, is LSC-funded, has been serving low-income veterans (under 200 percent of the FPL) for approximately 2 years; the program reports that it does receive SSVF referrals.

- The control site does not report a program-level specialization although the attorney we interviewed specializes in benefits. Our interviewee indicated that the control site strives to assist veterans with whatever legal requirements they have; they might refer to another attorney within the practice but do not generally refer outside their firm unless to the County Bar.

- Clients are referred to the control site program by 2 SSVF partners; the practice also maintains a legal advice line – any callers screened as veterans are referred internally to the veterans program at the control site. They also receive referrals from shelters, the

THE
CLOUDBURST
GROUP

VASH program, various caseworkers, and a monthly clinic at a community behavioral health center.

- The control site reports that its process for veterans intake is the same as for its other clients; the person making the referral fills out a conflicts and financial eligibility screen and a form that collects information on branch of service; number of deployments; discharge status; MOS; current level of service-connected disability; and data on previous applications for status changes.
- The decision to take on a veteran client's legal matter at the control site sometimes depends on the program's capacity at the time; the veteran's mental state and capability to assist counsel; and a thorough review of the personnel file, medical records and VA claims files.
- The control site has one attorney – our interviewee – who focuses on veterans' benefits; she is the only such staff attorney hired in the control site's 2-year history of serving veterans. She has received military cultural training and other cultural competency training.
- Case management is an active process at the control site as well, involving multiple meetings and phone calls; meetings can take place in the offices of the firm or in regional partners' locations in the community. In many cases younger veterans can be reached via e-mail or text, or through their caseworker.
- For required appearances, the control site also prepares clients for what to expect, and similarly takes into account any experience the client may have with trauma – the control site attorney spoke of their emphasis on "Safety, Predictability, and Control" in creating conducive settings for clients to participate and appear.
- The control site connects clients to SSVF, other housing, SSDI, and credit services.
- The control site estimates that it loses 20 percent of clients to follow-up over the course of an engagement – a number that is not surprising considering the priority of securing basic human needs, and the prevalence of behavioral health issues, in this population.
- The control site views the primary driver of a successful engagement to be an active client, and where appropriate having a caseworker actively engaged in mental health treatment makes a significant positive difference as well.

Summary of Results

The treatment site is favorably resolving 87 percent of the legal matters it is handling for its veteran clients – a success rate comparable overall to the comparison site, especially given the differences in client demographics and legal needs met. This result by itself is proof that the funding of the VLC program by CNCS, and the choice of subrecipients made by Equal Justice Works, were high-impact investments. By our calculations based on its outcomes data, Inner City Law Center averaged just under $1.7 million per year in lump-sum successful resolutions during the past three program years. This value does not take into account approximately $70,890 in *average monthly benefit or income amounts* which are recorded in ICLC's outcomes system but which could not be matched to quantities recorded by the control site. Annualized, these monthly benefits come to another approximately $851,000 per year.[20] When these are compared to Equal Justice Works' estimated annual program and matching investment (direct funding plus training and technical assistance) of $30,410, the result is a staggering 8,389% return on investment.

The staff attorneys of the treatment site report that the VLC fellows made it possible for them to serve clients they would not have been able to reach in the past, both directly and through second-order effects on reputation and partnership development.

We take these first two results to mean that 70-100 veterans per year are being served as a result of CNCS's investment in each legal fellow in the treatment program, with 87 percent of these veterans being assisted to a positive resolution of their legal matter.

The treatment site is obtaining higher win rates in matters closed with court decisions and is representing clients in *more challenging fora*, meaning that it has more matters closed with court decisions or via administrative agency decisions. These activities require more intensive client and case preparation, and the treatment site has adopted sophisticated client preparation processes, such as mooting, when clients are required to make appearances. Because of the complexity of the matters involved, and the requirement for legal representation in these fora, we further posit that many of the veterans making up the treatment site's client base would likely not have been assisted but for CNCS's investment in the VLC program.

While we found that the treatment site is not obtaining higher award amounts (with all other factors taken into consideration), this result most likely reflects site-to-site differences in recording the capitalized values of recurring awards.

---

[20] A more complicated actuarial analysis would be necessary to convert monthly benefit amounts to net present values, taking into account such factors as client life expectancy.

Appendix A. Data Abstraction Approach

The evaluation made use of administrative data from multiple, separate case management and client administration systems in use in treatment and control sites. It was at times necessary to transform data from these systems in order to render them sufficiently comparable to permit some analyses. The data transforms applied were the following:

- The year was extracted from each matter's closing date
- The initial character of the long-form closing code was extracted to create a single-character closing code
- A series of indicator (0-1) variables was created for close codes equal to F, G, H, or I respectively
- An indicator variable was created to receive a value of 1 when any close code in the set (F, G, H, I) was used, and 0 otherwise
- Case types were coded into a list of 8 different factors
- Through a series of steps, non-missing ages were coded into two factors – 18-59 or 60 and over
- Narrative case notes were reviewed and a variable was constructed to capture favorable outcomes that were not captured in other fields
- Monetary values were coded into another indicator variable reflecting favorable outcomes
- All favorable outcomes indicators were combined via logical OR to create a matter-level indicator reflecting any source of information pointing to a "success" in the matter
- A subset of those cases linked to outcomes (close codes F, G, H, or I) for treatment and for control sites were placed in a single analysis file for regression analysis; a separate variable in the file was used to label cases as having come from a treatment or control site.

Appendix B. Interview Questionnaire

1) Please describe your organization (size, locations, history in the community) and its mission as it relates to providing legal services to homeless and low-income veterans.
2) How long has your organization provided legal services to homeless and low-income veterans?
3) Do you see your program as having a specialty or area of focus with respect to homeless and low-income veterans' legal needs, such as benefits, or expungements, or landlord-tenant?
4) Please describe the ways in which homeless and low-income veteran clients report they find or are referred to your organization.
   a) Do homeless and low-income veteran clients come in without referrals? How did they learn about you?
   b) Which organizations refer clients to you? What services do they provide?
5) Please describe your process of homeless or low-income veteran client intake.
   a) Do you have multiple steps of intake? Does intake ever take more than one session?
   b) What types of employees are involved in intake? Who conducts the interview(s)?
   c) Is there a screening process?
   d) What documentation regarding the veteran and their legal matter do you review, and when?
6) Please describe the process by which you determine whether or not to take on a homeless or low-income veteran client's legal matter.
7) Please describe the process by which you assign a staff attorney, or make a referral.
8) Do you employ staff attorneys? If so, please describe how you select staff attorneys for employment.
9) What training do you provide your staff attorneys? Any training specific to veterans or homeless and low-income veterans, such as military cultural training?
10) Please describe your case management process for homeless and low-income veterans.
    a) Outreach and communication; how often do you meet with clients? Where do you meet with clients? What occurrences or events in the course of addressing a legal or administrative matter will prompt a face-to-face meeting?
    b) How do you reach clients when you need to? How do you collect and use contact information for them?
    c) Do you use any technology or software to manage cases and keep client matters on track? Do you provide clients with phones?
    d) How do you prepare clients for appearances, when this is necessary?
    e) Do you connect clients with other service providers for non-legal services? How often and in what circumstances?
    f) Do you ever lose clients to follow-up? How often? Why, if you know?
11) What is the most important driver of successful resolution of clients' matters, in your view? How have you incorporated this understanding into your processes and practices?
12) What is the biggest barrier or challenge to successful resolution of clients' matters, in your view? How have you incorporated this understanding into your processes and practices?

Appendix C. Data Analysis Routines

```
# Read in file
vlce<-read.table(file="c:/rdata/vlce.final.yrs/vlce102915.csv",header=TRUE,sep=",")
# Force numeric-looking fields to factors so they're not treated like numbers
vlce$problemcode <- as.factor(vlce$problemcode)
vlce$yearclosed <- as.factor(vlce$yearclosed)
# Visually check the distributions and ranges and types of the variables
summary(vlce)
# Do an initial check comparing success rates
ttest1 <- t.test(vlce$outcome[vlce$studygroup=="T"],vlce$outcome[vlce$studygroup=="C"])
ttest1
# Do an initial check comparing average dollar values of awards
ttest2 <- t.test(vlce$monetary[vlce$studygroup=="T"],vlce$monetary[vlce$studygroup=="C"])
ttest2
# Do an initial check comparing rates of recovery of monetary awards
ttest3 <- t.test(vlce$anymonetary[vlce$studygroup=="T"],vlce$anymonetary[vlce$studygroup=="C"])
ttest3
# Run a logistic regression of success rates on client and case characteristics
reg3 <- glm(outcome ~ studygroup + problemcode + gender + agecode + raceeth + disabled,
family=binomial("logit"), data=vlce)
summary(reg3)
# Run a general linear model of success rates on client and case characteristics
reg5 <- glm(monetary ~ studygroup + problemcode + gender + agecode + raceeth + disabled,
data=vlce)
summary(reg5)
# Run a logistic regression of probability of recovering $ on client and case characteristics
reg6 <- glm(anymonetary ~ studygroup + problemcode + gender + agecode + raceeth + disabled,
family=binomial("logit"), data=vlce)
summary(reg6)
# Create simple tables to compare average awards across case types and demographic groups
aggregate(vlce$monetary ~ vlce$problemcode + vlce$studygroup, FUN=mean)
aggregate(vlce$monetary ~ vlce$problemcode + vlce$studygroup, FUN=length)
aggregate(vlce$monetary ~ vlce$raceeth + vlce$studygroup, FUN=mean)
aggregate(vlce$monetary ~ vlce$raceeth + vlce$studygroup, FUN=length)
aggregate(vlce$monetary ~ vlce$gender + vlce$studygroup, FUN=mean)
aggregate(vlce$monetary ~ vlce$gender + vlce$studygroup, FUN=length)
aggregate(vlce$monetary ~ vlce$agecode + vlce$studygroup, FUN=mean)
aggregate(vlce$monetary ~ vlce$agecode + vlce$studygroup, FUN=length)
aggregate(vlce$monetary ~ vlce$disabled + vlce$studygroup, FUN=mean)
aggregate(vlce$monetary ~ vlce$disabled + vlce$studygroup, FUN=length)
# Examine distribution of case volume (cases with outcomes) across years
table(vlce$yearclosed, vlce$studygroup)
# Create simple tables to compare total award volumes across years
aggregate(vlce$monetary ~ vlce$yearclosed + vlce$studygroup, FUN=mean)
aggregate(vlce$monetary ~ vlce$yearclosed + vlce$studygroup, FUN=sum)
# Store all data, objects, and command history
save.image()
# Exit
q()
```